



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## NOTES

### ACADEMIC LIBERTY

As an elastic currency is one that not only expands, but also contracts, as required by trade, so academic liberty is that which allows absolute freedom of scientific discussion, not only in regard to the popular side of a question, but also in regard to the unpopular side—if there be one. The very essence of this liberty among scholars is the right to express convictions, based upon honest investigation, no matter who is hit, high or low. To this principle the *Journal of Political Economy* is, and always has been, pledged. For this reason, it is necessary to protest against the unscientific attitude, which recently has appeared in certain quarters, and which consciously or unconsciously objects to a fair discussion of both sides of the labor-union question, or of the railway problem.

The party of sentiment are so sure of their ground on questions touching labor that a critical and reasoning process is regarded as an act of hostility to labor, when by all seekers of truth it should be warmly welcomed. It is high time to wake up the judicial state of mind, and declare for an impartial economic spirit. Today the laborer scarcely ever hears anything which he ought to be told, provided it is disagreeable to him. Such a method, it is needless to say, blocks the very pathway of progress to the workingmen.

On the railway question the prevailing tone is one of general hostility to large corporations. In some academic circles the necessity of appearing on good terms with the masses goes so far that only the mass-point-of-view is given recognition; and the presentation of the truth, if it happens to traverse the popular case, is regarded with something akin to consternation. In short, it is not amiss to demand that measure of academic freedom that will permit a fair discussion of the rights of those who do not have the popular acclaim. It is going too far when a carefully reasoned argument which happens to support the contentions of the railways is treated as if necessarily the outcome of bribery by the money kings. So simple a proposition would seem childish had it not been conspicuously denied recently by men of prominence in official life.

When Professor Hugo R. Meyer, of this university, was invited

to testify before the Senate Committee on Railways, his examination so nettled Mr. Clements, an interstate commerce commissioner, that he gave forth the following statement, insulting to every colleague of Professor Meyer:

Wealth always finds it is easy to employ men of theory and doctrine and ability to express its views, and they are often directed to educating the public up to the idea of the superior sanctity of vested rights as against individual rights and individual opportunities in the contests in which men engage in the different walks of life. It is ordinarily to be expected that these gentlemen would attack a doctrine or practice that was at variance to the doctrines dear to the patron saint of that institution whose colossal fortune had its inception and support to a large measure in the rebates in the early times of this business of Standard Oil, etc., which came like a mildew, like an overreaching cloud that leveled all competitors and gave the field to him, a position he still occupies. They employ not only able lawyers and other people to represent their views as a means of disseminating their doctrines, but they found colleges and institutions of learning that the younger generation may be taught the superior sanctity of vested rights and vested property.

The imputation that men in the department of economics are influenced in any way whatever, or even put under any kind of pressure to revise their views, is absolutely false in every particular. No one knows this better than the students in our classes. As regards Professor Meyer, he had carried on his studies mainly, at Harvard University, and had practically completed his books (now being published) before he had any connection with the University of Chicago. Moreover, when he was engaged, this university did not know, and in principle did not inquire—as it has not of any other economist—what his personal convictions were on any subject. I speak from full knowledge on this matter. Nor has anyone ever severed his connection with our department because of any views which he may have held. In fact, the choice of economists and their academic liberty in the University of Chicago are absolutely unaffected by any relations whatever to its donors; in that respect this university is as untrammelled as other universities, like Harvard, Cornell, and Columbia, which have had large gifts from Mr. Rockefeller.

The extraordinary perversion of truth may be illustrated by another example. Senator J. P. Dolliver, of Iowa, in a political speech in Kansas recently is reported to have declared that some years ago Professor Meyer put forth a book on railways containing

"good wholesome political economy and sociology," while a professor at the University of Wisconsin, where he followed the views of his chief, Professor Ely. But, the senator added, this Professor Meyer accepted a call to the University of Chicago, and, after some years of service there, he had put out another book on railways in which his former doctrines were wholly denied, thus showing the necessity of revising his opinions when called to the University of Chicago. Thereupon the oratorical senator is said to have exclaimed that "the University of Chicago smelled of oil like a Kansas town." The humor of the situation to those conversant with railway literature is apparent: the professor at Wisconsin then and now is Balthazar H. Meyer; while the incumbent at Chicago is Hugo R. Meyer. Doubtless the Wisconsin professor has a fair ground for libel.

But the humor of the situation dies away for those who have watched the course of serious journalism for decades, when the *New York Nation* (October 26, 1905), in discussing the college president, says:

When we remember how ignorant and unreasoning the patrons of education often are, the wonder is that more colleges do not, as Senator Dolliver put it, "smell of oil."

If the conclusions of the *Nation* are as little founded as those of the senator so approvingly quoted, we may have good reason to lament the decay of its old-time prestige.

J. LAURENCE LAUGHLIN.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

---

## RECENT ILLINOIS DECISIONS REGARDING INJUNCTIONS ISSUED IN THE COURSE OF STRIKES

*O'Brien vs. People*, 216 Ill. 354, June 23, 1905.—This case, and a number of others reported with it, arose upon appeals from sentences imposed for contempt of court. The contempt had been committed by violating injunctions which had been obtained by a manufacturing company against its striking employees and their sympathizers. The strike had been called because the company had refused to sign a closed-shop agreement.

The substance of the injunction orders is set forth in *114 Ill. Appell. Reports*, p. 40. Among the acts and things restrained were the following: the use of threats, intimidation, force, violence, or